

Notice of Allowability

Application No.

09/758,972

Applicant(s)

JAGGI, SANDEEP

Examiner

Beth Van Doren

Art Unit

3623

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address--

All claims being allowable, PROSECUTION ON THE MERITS IS (OR REMAINS) CLOSED in this application. If not included herewith (or previously mailed), a Notice of Allowance (PTOL-85) or other appropriate communication will be mailed in due course. **THIS NOTICE OF ALLOWABILITY IS NOT A GRANT OF PATENT RIGHTS.** This application is subject to withdrawal from issue at the initiative of the Office or upon petition by the applicant. See 37 CFR 1.313 and MPEP 1308.

1. ☒ This communication is responsive to communications received 02/06/2006.
2. ☒ The allowed claim(s) is/are 21-24 and 26-30.
3. ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of the:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* Certified copies not received: _____.

Applicant has THREE MONTHS FROM THE "MAILING DATE" of this communication to file a reply complying with the requirements noted below. Failure to timely comply will result in ABANDONMENT of this application.

THIS THREE-MONTH PERIOD IS NOT EXTENDABLE.

4. ☐ A SUBSTITUTE OATH OR DECLARATION must be submitted. Note the attached EXAMINER'S AMENDMENT or NOTICE OF INFORMAL PATENT APPLICATION (PTO-152) which gives reason(s) why the oath or declaration is deficient.
5. ☐ CORRECTED DRAWINGS (as "replacement sheets") must be submitted.
- (a) ☐ including changes required by the Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) attached
- 1) ☐ hereto or 2) ☐ to Paper No./Mail Date _____.
- (b) ☐ including changes required by the attached Examiner's Amendment / Comment or in the Office action of Paper No./Mail Date _____.
- Identifying indicia such as the application number (see 37 CFR 1.84(c)) should be written on the drawings in the front (not the back) of each sheet. Replacement sheet(s) should be labeled as such in the header according to 37 CFR 1.121(d).
6. ☐ DEPOSIT OF and/or INFORMATION about the deposit of BIOLOGICAL MATERIAL must be submitted. Note the attached Examiner's comment regarding REQUIREMENT FOR THE DEPOSIT OF BIOLOGICAL MATERIAL.

Attachment(s)

1. ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2. ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3. ☒ Information Disclosure Statements (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08),
Paper No./Mail Date 20060206
4. ☐ Examiner's Comment Regarding Requirement for Deposit of Biological Material
5. ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6. ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413),
Paper No./Mail Date _____.
7. ☒ Examiner's Amendment/Comment
8. ☒ Examiner's Statement of Reasons for Allowance
9. ☐ Other _____.


TARIQ R. HAFIZ
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600

DETAILED ACTION

1. The following statement of reasons for allowance is in response to communications received on 02/06/2006. Claims 1-20 were canceled in this communications and claims 21-30 were added. Therefore, claims 21-30 were pending in this communication. In a telephonic interview on 04/14/2006, claim 25 was canceled and claims 21, 29, and 30 were amended via an Examiner's amendment (see below). Therefore, claims 21-14 and 26-30 are now pending in this application and are allowed.

Examiner's Amendment

2. An examiner's amendment to the record appears below. Should the changes be unacceptable to the applicant, an amendment may be filed as provided by 37 CFR 1.312. To ensure consideration of such an amendment, it **MUST** be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee.

Authorization for this examiner's amendment was given in a telephone interview with Mr. Chris Maiorana on April 14, 2006. The application has been amended as follows:

In claim 21 –

please amend element (L) as follows:

(L) sending automatically on said first reminder date to said outside council a first reminder email to complete said first task if said first conditional response is set, wherein a supervisor does not receive said first reminder email;

and add the following after element (L):

Art Unit: 3623

(M) receiving from said events engine database as selected by said in-house council a second conditional response for said first task, wherein said second conditional response is (i) set when said first reminder event occurs and (ii) performed if set when a second reminder event occurs;

(N) calculating a second reminder date for said second reminder event; and

(O) sending automatically on said second reminder date to both (i) said outside council and (ii) said supervisor, a second reminder email to complete said first task if said second conditional response is set.

In claim 24, please amend as follows:

24. The method according to claim 21, further comprising the steps of:

assigning from said membership information database a supervisor of said outside council based on a third input from said individual[, wherein said supervisor did not receive said first reminder email;

receiving from said events engine database as selected by said in-house council a second conditional response for said first task, wherein said second conditional response is set when said first reminder event occurs and (ii) performed if set when a second reminder event occurs;

calculating a second reminder date for said second reminder event]; and

storing in said calendar database said second reminder date.

Please cancel claim 25

Art Unit: 3623

Please amend claim 27 as follows:

27. The method according to claim further comprising the step of:

sending automatically on said second event date to said outside council [a] said second reminder email to complete said second task if said first task is completed.

Please amend claim 28 as follows:

28. The method according to claim 21, further comprising a storage medium recording a computer program having the steps (A) through [(L)] (O).

In claim 29 –

please amend element (L) as follows:

(L) send automatically on said first reminder date to said outside council a first reminder email to complete said first task if said first conditional response is set, wherein a supervisor does not receive said first reminder email;

and add the following after element (L):

(M) receive from said events engine database as selected by said in-house council a second conditional response for said first task, wherein said second conditional response is (i) set when said first reminder event occurs and (ii) performed if set when a second reminder event occurs;

(N) calculate a second reminder date for said second reminder event; and

Art Unit: 3623

(O) send automatically on said second reminder date to both (i) said outside council and (ii) said supervisor, a second reminder email to complete said first task if said second conditional response is set.

In claim 30 –

please amend the current final limitation as follows:

means for sending automatically on said first reminder date to said outside council a first reminder email to complete said first task if said first conditional response is set, wherein a supervisor does not receive said first reminder email;

and add the following limitations after this element:

(M) means for receiving from said events engine database as selected by said in-house council a second conditional response for said first task, wherein said second conditional response is (i) set when said first reminder event occurs and (ii) performed if set when a second reminder event occurs;

(N) means for calculating a second reminder date for said second reminder event; and

(O) means for sending automatically on said second reminder date to both (i) said outside council and (ii) said supervisor, a second reminder email to complete said first task if said second conditional response is set.

Reasons for Allowance

3. Claims 21-24 and 26-30 are allowed.
4. The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance: None of the prior art of record, taken individually or in any combination, teach, inter alia, a membership information

Art Unit: 3623

database with in-house and outside council, wherein a first conditional response is set based on an authorization event and performed when a first reminder event (with a calculated first reminder date) occurs and wherein a second conditional response for said first task, as selected by said in-house council, is set when said first reminder event occurs and performed when a second reminder event (with a calculated second reminder date) occurs, wherein the second reminder event is an email sent to both said outside council and a supervisor, where the supervisor did not receive said first reminder event.

The prior art references most closely resembling the Applicant's claimed invention are Srinivasan (U.S. 5,548,506), Grow (U.S. 6,694,315), Kamarei et al. (U.S. 6,859,806), and Whitmyer et al. (U.S. 5,895,468).

First, Srinivasan teaches a project management system that manages multiple work groups and projects. The system includes a module that tracks project and task deadlines and also a reminder module that automatically sends reminders to task leaders in charge of pending tasks. Srinivasan, however, does not expressly disclose in-house and outside council, a first conditional response set based on an authorization event and performed when a first reminder event occurs, a second conditional response selected by said in-house council that is set when said first reminder event occurs and performed when a second reminder event, or that the second reminder event is an email sent to both said outside council and a supervisor, where the supervisor did not receive said first reminder event.

Second, Grow discloses a document assembly and docketing system, wherein a docket and associated action has a critical date and a notification date used to send reminders to user workstations over the network. The system has a table of users associated with the system, a

Art Unit: 3623

table of cases (and case related data), and a table of forms used in association with the cases.

Each docketed case has an associated deadline chart. This chart includes trigger dates, where certain events have specified time periods within which the user must take action. For example, if a complaint is served, the date of the complaint serves as a trigger date for filing an Answer (i.e. an Answer must be filed 30 days after the trigger date). Associated with these trigger dates and actions are notification dates. The notification dates can be set as a critical date (i.e. the date the action is due) or can be set several days in advance of the critical date so that the user is reminded to complete the task associated with the action. Using notification dates, email reminders/notifications are generated and sent to the user based on stored email address information. Reminders may also be pages, telephone calls, etc. The reminder can be sent to the specific attorney associated with the case, the attorney's secretary, paralegal, client, etc. as well as to the attorney's supervisor. The computer sends a first reminder and then continues to send subsequent reminders at predetermined intervals until affirmative acknowledgement is received. If no acknowledgement is received, an alert may be sent to an administrator, who did not receive the previous emails. However, Grow does not expressly disclose that the user table includes in-house and outside council, that a first conditional response is set based on an authorization event and performed when a first reminder event (with a calculated first reminder date) occurs, that a second conditional response, as selected by said in-house council, is set when said first reminder event occurs and performed when a second reminder event occurs, or that the second reminder event is an email sent to both said outside council and a supervisor, where the supervisor did not receive said first reminder event.

Next, Kamarei et al. discloses an online legal docketing system using customizable client rules. Once an action occurs, the system computes an action due date using pattern data dates and a time calculus. The docketing system includes a host server system, a governmental system, and a third-party authorized system, wherein the third party authorized system includes an attorney or one who has a power of attorney. Pattern data includes one or a combination of a case filing date, an official action mail date, an entry of a judgment date, etc. An action includes filing a patent, filing a trademark, filing a response, filing a legal form, submitting fees, etc. The action and action due date provide the means to notify user of the system that an action must occur in the governmental or legal proceeding and the time the action should be taken. Using this action and action due date data, a reminder is sent in advance of the time the action should be taken. The reminder is sent using an electronic mail message system that includes an electronic mail list identified for the legal case. Legal docketing is accomplished using such a reminder scheduling and calendaring system. However, Kamarei et al. does not expressly disclose a second conditional response for a first task, as selected by said in-house council, being set when a first reminder event occurs and performed when a second reminder event (with a calculated second reminder date) occurs, wherein the second reminder event is an email sent to both said outside council and a supervisor, where the supervisor did not receive said first reminder event.

Finally, Whitmyer et al. discloses a system that delivers professional services, such as providing reminders to a client based on information in the database of the system. The system stores a plurality of client reminders in the database of the system and automatically generates a client response form based on the retrieved reminder, which is automatically transmitted to the

Art Unit: 3623

client. The system is used with a docket database and queries the database based on the date to retrieve a reminder associated with the docket. However, Whitmyer et al. does not expressly disclose in-house and outside council, a first conditional response set based on an authorization event and performed when a first reminder event occurs, a second conditional response selected by said in-house council that is set when said first reminder event occurs and performed when a second reminder event, or that the second reminder event is an email sent to both said outside council and a supervisor, where the supervisor did not receive said first reminder event.

5. Any comments considered necessary by the Applicant must be submitted by no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statements for Reasons for Allowance".

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Grainger (U.S. 2002/0091542) discloses a docket management system that includes a database of authorized participants and creating a series of reminders and due dates for tasks based on business rules, wherein the there are soft and hard reminder dates.

Whitmyer, Jr. (U.S. 6,049,801) discloses a docket management system that uses reminders in association with due dates of a document in response to an action.

Hillstrom (U.S. 2002/0002469) discloses personnel and supervisory systems for legal management including email reminders being sent to all necessary participants to enforce timely completion.

Grainger (U.S. 2002/0161733) discloses a docket management system that includes a database of authorized participants and creating a series of reminders and due dates for tasks based on business rules, wherein there are soft and hard reminder dates.

Hughes et al. (U.S. 5,893,074) teaches task management and project controlling including using reminders to ensure that tasks of the project are completed in a timely manner.

Kroeger (U.S. 2002/0128889) discloses a proactive task manager that sends email reminders on set dates.

Herrero (U.S. 2002/0078007) discloses reminder notifications to ensure completion of a task using email programs.

Carlson et al. (U.S. 2002/0169841) discloses task management and generating reminders with due dates using an email program.

“ELF Technologies, Inc. announces Elf Legal Service” (PR Newswire) teaches a legal services software package that pulls information from time and billing, docketing, and other law firm applications and uses this information to manage the docket, such as by the sending of reminders.

Roper (“Desktop programs to organize your work and time”) discloses Personal Information Manager (PIM) programs that manage tasks, including through the sending of reminders.

Art Unit: 3623

“AbacusLaw: Calendar, Case Management, and Lots More” (Law Office Technology Review) teaches a docket manager program that generates events such as deadlines or reminders.


“Shareware Docketing for the Small Office” (Law Office Technology Review) teaches docketing programs, such as DocketMinder, that has entry screens for client and matter information and allows information such as due date and attorneys to input and further sends reminders of the due dates.

“Scheduler Redux: New Versions of Abacus Law and DiaryMaster” (Law Office Technology Review) discloses docket and calendaring programs that send reminders to users for appointments, court hearings, and other milestones.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Beth Van Doren whose telephone number is (571) 272-6737. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner’s supervisor, Tariq Hafiz can be reached on (571) 272-6729. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


bvd

April 14, 2006


TARIQ R. HAFIZ
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600